

**REMARKS**

By the present amendment, claims 1, 6, and 8 have been amended to specify that the transparent protective film is a triacetylcellulose film, and the adhesive does not comprise polyvinyl alcohol, and claim 13 has been amended to specify that the adhesive does not comprise polyvinyl alcohol, and the adhesive layer is applied after a dichroic substance treatment. Support for these recitations is found in the original application, in particular the Examples.

Accordingly, claim 2 has been cancelled.

Claims 1 and 3-24 are pending in the present application. Claims 1, 6, 8, and 13 are the only independent claims.

In the Office Action, claims claims 1-6, 9-14, and 16-22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over US 4,166,871 to Schuler ("Schuler") in view of US 3,531,351 to Buzzell ("Buzzell").

Further, claim 7 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over Schuler in view of Buzzell and further in view of US 4,545,648 to Schulman ("Schulman"), claims 8 and 23-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over Schulman in view of Schuler and Buzzell, and claim 15 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over Schuler in view of Buzzell and further in view of US 3,015,989 to Delangre ("Delangre").

Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections is respectfully requested. Schuler adheres a cellulose acetate butyrate to a PVA polarizer using "an adhesive comprising polyvinyl alcohol, methanol, a crosslinking agent and water" (Schuler at col. 4, lines 24-26). Accordingly,

following the teachings of Schuler, a person of ordinary skill in the art would have added a crosslinking agent if PVA is present in the adhesive, but Schuler does not provide any suggestion or motivation to add a crosslinking agent when PVA is not present in the adhesive. In any case, Schuler uses a cellulose acetate butyrate protective film (see Schuler at col. 4, line 19), so that Schuler does not provide any guidance regarding improvements to an adhesive in connection with a triacetylcellulose protective film. Also, in Schuler, the cellulose acetate butyrate protective film is laminated to the polyvinyl alcohol film before the iodine stain bath treatment (see Schuler at col. 4, lines 27-35), so that Schuler does not provide any guidance regarding improvements to an adhesive in connection to a PVA film that has already been submitted to such iodine stain bath treatment.

Further, Buzzell provides either water alone or a PVA solution as the adhesive, so that Buzzell does not remedy the deficiencies of Schuler. The other cited references also fail to remedy these deficiencies of Schuler.

In contrast, in the presently claimed invention as claimed in present claims 1, 6, and 8, the transparent protective film is a triacetylcellulose film, and the adhesive contains a water-soluble crosslinking agent capable of crosslinking a vinyl alcohol-based polymer, and a catalyst, but it does not contain PVA.

Further, in the presently claimed invention as claimed in present claim 13, the adhesive contains a water-soluble crosslinking agent but it does not contain PVA, and the adhesive layer is applied after a dichroic substance treatment.

Advantages of these features of the presently claimed invention are that adhesive properties can be unexpectedly and considerably improved, for example, durability and resistance to peeling, while maintaining excellent optical properties, as disclosed in the present specification. In particular, with respect to claim 13, since the adhesive is applied after the dichroic substance treatment, the PVA film can be dyed directly and sufficiently, so that optical properties of the polarizer can be improved. Also, with respect to claim 13, since the adhesive is applied after the dichroic substance treatment, dipping in a solution after bonding, and corresponding degradation that might cause a tendency to peel, can be avoided.

These features of the presently claimed invention and their advantages are not disclosed in Schuler or Buzzell, and the other cited references fail to remedy these deficiencies. Therefore, the present claims are not obvious over the cited references taken alone or in any combination.

In view of the above, it is submitted that the rejections should be withdrawn.


In conclusion, the invention as presently claimed is patentable. It is believed that the claims are in allowable condition and a notice to that effect is earnestly requested.

If there is, in the Examiner's opinion, any outstanding issue and such issue may be resolved by means of a telephone interview, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned attorney at the telephone number listed below.

Amendment  
Serial No. 10/071,301  
Attorney Docket No. 020588

If this paper is not considered to be timely filed, the Applicants hereby petition for an appropriate extension of the response period. Please charge the fee for such extension and any other fees which may be required to Deposit Account No. 50-2866.

Respectfully submitted,  
**WESTERMAN, HATTORI, DANIELS & ADRIAN, LLP**



Nicolas E. Seckel  
Attorney for Applicants  
Reg. No. 44,373  
Telephone: (202) 822-1100  
Facsimile: (202) 822-1111

NES/rep